



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, February, 1900.

THE SEVENTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION.

THE Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the Modern Language Association of America was held at Columbia University in New York on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, December 27, 28, 29, 1899. In calling the meeting to order, and in introducing President Seth Low of Columbia, the President of the Association, Prof. von Jagemann of Harvard, himself one of the pioneer members, referred to the circumstance that sixteen years before the Association had held its first meeting at Columbia. President Low welcomed the Association on behalf of Columbia: He had not realized that the Association was returning to its natal place; but while this was at the old site on 49th Street and the buildings had changed, the greeting was as hearty and cordial as ever. A university, like the arc-light, sheds rays on every hand; through specialization, like the head light, it also illuminates very distinctly a narrow path. The study of the Modern Languages, particularly, enlarges the world in which a man lives. It used to be considered enough to know what ancient wisdom had to say; there is also wisdom in contemporary life. These studies insisted on equal rights with others, and nothing more strongly forced the elective system upon the colleges. For all these reasons the subjects treated by the Association command the hearty sympathy of all workers, and it is because Columbia has this sympathy that these few words have been said.

Every meeting seems to have a definite note struck which becomes characteristic. The dominant note sounded at the University of Virginia the year before was that of the new romanticism (see article in *Univ. Va. Alumni Bulletin*, Feb., 1899); somehow, it seemed to comport with the mild weather and the bright Southern skies. In New York cold and some snow prevailed, and the wind whistling about University Heights seemed to demand greater severity. The sum of the impressions from the

papers at the Columbia meeting was more complex, but gave clear evidence of added variety, intensity, and strength. Growth in many directions, and in various interests, is the marked characteristic of the work of the Association for the four or five years from the time of the Whitney Memorial Meeting at Pennsylvania, and the Yale meeting of 1895.

This will be evident from a rough division into which the papers of the present meeting may conveniently fall: I. Rhetorical Method—a newer phase and a distinct note coming from an evident general literary aspiration, and an altogether new attention to scientific pedagogical and rhetorical theory, and practical composition work in school and college. II. Modern Literature—the period after the middle of the sixteenth century—under which a larger and larger proportion of papers tends to fall. III. Medieval Literature. IV. Linguistic Studies. V. Phonetics. And VI. Pedagogical Discussion—arising from the publication of the Report of the Committee of Twelve on Modern Language teaching.

I. *Rhetorical Method.* The President's address by Prof. von Jagemann of Harvard on "Philology and Purism" gave early suggestion for the later animated discussion on Dictionaries and Grammar. Every language needs new modes of expression. What general principles should govern their adoption, and what can be done to cause these principles to be accepted? Too narrow ground has been taken in previous efforts. Use in this or that masterpiece, by any given author, or in any country, as in America but not in England, matters little: the real question is, to what extent has the language to gain or lose, and how far are the advantages and disadvantages balanced? The joke about the proof-reader changing the Dictionary was not that he changed it, but that people laughed at him because he did change it. The philologist can take the initiative in efforts to improve speech because his knowledge of the language and literature of all periods better enables him to understand and to judge fully literary and linguistic problems.

In a paper "On Modern English Dictionaries" Miss Leavens of Brooklyn, who adopted as her

text Hamlet's reply to Polonius, "Words, words, words," started a very general discussion on common usage, inaccuracies of speech, changes, and questions of authority. Prof. Emerson of Western Reserve emphasized the need in all the Dictionaries of the scientific treatment and application of the law of Germanic accent, with the consequent changes in usage and meaning. The discussion thus started grew in momentum with the next paper on the "Figurative elements in the terminology of English Grammar" by Prof. Scott of Michigan—an interesting psychological study based on experiments in the Detroit schools. Taking definitions from Whitney's English Grammar he sought to find out the images aroused by the words in the child's mind. "Parts" of speech were conceived as "organs" of speech; the verb "governs" the noun as the teacher governs school; the "irregular" verb was a naughty one, or was one used in the wrong place, or one seldom used; the "objective" case was something to throw at, as, "The boy hit the dog"; a "case" was a box, or a chest of drawers, even a covering for sausages, or, from the practise of diagrams, something dropped below. The writer admitted any other designations would be just as bad, and urged a closer connection between Grammar and living speech. Prof. Stoddard of New York found no particular objections that images were aroused, but was inclined to think that such conceptions were those of older minds commenting later on the phenomena. This doubt was likewise expressed by Prof. Cohn of Columbia: he could not recall ever having any such conceptions. Prof. Todd of Columbia believed no one would likely have, such who, like Prof. Cohn and himself, had obtained their grammatical ideas through Latin terminology. Prof. Bright of Johns Hopkins declared if the terminology thus stimulated the imagination, it was no ways objectionable. Prof. Greene of Johns Hopkins queried what could be used? We are bound to have some terminology.

A fourth paper connected with these was that of Dr. Buck of Vassar on "The present status of rhetorical theory." The "anti-social" conception of discourse by the Sophists treated Rhetoric as an art of war, a struggle of the

strong against the weak, and brought a false stigma upon the name. Plato gave it a "social" conception, where it was held to be a process of direct communication and transfer from speaker to hearer whose interests were one. The modern theory in the best text-books accepts this, as at least implied if not explicitly stated. No longer limited to Persuasion alone, the subject-matter has direct relation to all mental processes: the modern study of Rhetoric is as large in outline as formerly, and more complete in details.

II. *Modern Literature.* The contemporary spirit which was prominent at the Virginia meeting, was again here; but it was not romantic. "Fatalism in Hauptmann's dramas" was the subject of a paper by Dr. Schuetze of Pennsylvania. It was not an isolated phenomenon treated, but one representative of extreme naturalism as derived from Taine's theories by Zola, Tolstoi, Hardy, Pinero, Ibsen, the later Björnsen, Max Halbe, Hauptmann, and others. In Germany Sudermann and Ludwig Fulda do not belong here. Materialism is the dominant factor, the positive philosophy of John Stuart Mill being its source. Zola gave the prescription in his *roman expérimental*, whereby everything is due to heredity and *milieu*: collect facts, group them, and deduce. In classical German drama, in Shakespeare, Schiller, Kleist, there is absolute freedom of will and the characters are held responsible; in this school there is no responsibility and no moral guilt. Outside forces determine character, and action can be calculated with unerring precision. In America Howells gives details, but does not bring out their fatal bearing, as does the English Hardy. With Hauptmann the scenery of the first act is not accidental, but significant, and is suggestive of the hereditary acts. There is an absence of great characters due to the plea that the author is not responsible for his characters. The 'brutal fact,' all characteristic, is the device of contrast in bringing the idea of fatalism home. Related to this paper was one read by title, by Prof. Faust of Wesleyan, on "Problematical characters in German fiction," tracing a certain type from Goethe, through Jean Paul, Spielhagen, and Keller, to Sudermann.

In sharp contrast with this analysis of Ger-

man "fatalism" was the interpretation of English "idealism" in "The Nature Poetry of Shelley and his contemporaries" by Prof. Edgar of Toronto. The part of the paper given was a comparison between Shelley and Keats. Keats' treatment of Nature was frankly sensuous and pagan, as in the *Nightingale* and in *Endymion*; Shelley's was more spiritual and with a higher mystical perception of Beauty. As colourists it is commonly thought that Keats surpasses Shelley; but a tabulated statement of colour effects in both proves Shelley's variety to be astonishing. Grant Allen's dictum that poets use the red end of the spectrum rather than the violet, from the results obtained, must also be amended.

"The first centenary of the birth of Leopardi" by Prof. Menger of Bryn Mawr, should have been noted the year before (June 29, 1898). There was a celebration by the students of Rome and by the Government. The first took the form of a movement to have a course of lectures at the University; prizes were offered for the best essay and for poems; a monument was erected; and a memorial published. Despite drawbacks and difficulties the movement was made national: many lyrics were called forth; inedited Mss. brought out; his tomb declared a national monument; a bust placed in the Senate house; and streets and buildings in his native province named for him. Mr. Shaw of Johns Hopkins commented at some length upon Leopardi's melancholy, and spoke of the new explanation for this in his suffering from a weakness of the perceptive faculties, a failure to distinguish color, and the inability of the sensory organs generally to represent the outside world.

It was the year of the 150th anniversary of Goethe's birth, and two or three papers derived immediately from Goethe. Prof. Faust's paper, already mentioned, started from a definition by Goethe: "problematical characters" are those "who can never master the situation into which they are placed, yet to whom no situation in life is adequate," and traced a type of character from Goethe. "The curse-idea in Goethe's *Iphigenie auf Tauris*" by Dr. Eggert of Chicago was read, in his absence, by Prof. Gruener of Yale. The paper was directed chiefly against a theory of Kuno Fischer's.

Goethe, the student of evolution, could not use an antiquated superstition as a motive for the noble conception of Iphigenie. The law of heredity would explain the deeds of ancestors, and the intensely modern character of the drama leaves no room for the operation of a curse. Prof. Thomas of Columbia believed that Goethe was essentially a poet of the concrete, and that the starting point was the concrete mental image and not an abstract idea.

"The first paralipomenon of Goethe's *Faust*, when written?" a paper by Prof. Manning of Delaware, entered the lists for an earlier date than those generally assigned. All the conditions were realized in the early seventies; if written later than 1775, it is not significant. Things got clearer as Goethe cleared them. The plan is in Goethe's own hand, and shows the influence of Spinoza's *Ethics* upon his youth. Men write abstractly in early life and become concrete later.

"Contributions to English literary criticism culled from eighteenth century letter writers," by Prof. Hulme of Western Reserve, was only announced by title—a contemplated study of the English letter writers of that period with reference to the literary criticism scattered through their pages. Another eighteenth century contribution was "A study of Pope's Imitations of Horace," by Prof. Tupper of Ontario, from a comparison with the Latin originals. Pope's personal tone is keener, more like Juvenal than the urbane Horace, and Pope has many individual affectations of manner. Changes from the Latin are made to suit English conditions; but in spirit, contrary to Dr. Johnson's opinion, between Roman similitudes and English images there is no real difference.

The Elizabethan drama and Shakespeare were the sources of two papers. "The influence of Court Masques on the drama, 1605-15," by Prof. Thorndike of Western Reserve, brought Shakespeare's latest work into question. The date of *The Winter's Tale* may be determined from the anti-masque of the Satyrs which appeared in Ben Jonson's *Oberon* in 1611. So the masque in *The Tempest* throws light on the play: Shakespeare adopted the convention and forced it into service with his imagination. "The episodes in Shakespeare's *I. Henry VI.*," by Prof. Henneman of Tennes-

see, touched Shakespeare at his beginning period. It was sought to make more definite what had hitherto been vague suggestion, as to just where and how specific repetitions and contradictions and obvious developments show that an older Talbot play was worked over into a Henry VI. drama. In the discussion Prof. Hulme of Western Reserve cited from Madden's *Diary of Master William Silence* two references to Elizabethan sport that he held to be undoubted passages of Shakespeare's, and with Madden he thought such references to outdoor life constituted a new test of Shakespeare's genuine work, though their absence could not of itself disprove Shakespeare's authorship. Prof. Garnett of Baltimore also concurred in the belief that an older Talbot play had been worked over, and that the wooing scene was Shakespeare's and had been inserted to prepare for Part ii.

III. *Medieval Literature.* The paper by Prof. Rennert of Pennsylvania on "The Spanish poet Luis Barahona de Soto," which was read by title, treating an author praised by Cervantes, lies on the border-land between medieval and modern, and, although nearer the modern, is best grouped with kindred Spanish subjects. "An incident in the *Poema de Fernan Gonzalez*," by Prof. Marden of Johns Hopkins, strove, by fixing the relations between certain portions of the Spanish epic poem and corresponding chapters of the Prose Chronicle of Alfonso the Wise, to determine more exactly the date. Count Fernan Gonzalez is one of the most interesting figures in old Spanish literature, and the poem written in his honor contains the earliest version of many well-known legends of Christian Spain. The paper was discussed by Prof. de Haan of Bryn Mawr and Dr. Bourland of Michigan. Dr. Bourland contributed a kindred paper "On the date of the *Rimed Chronicle* of the Cid." This was not an unformed series of songs, but a fragment of a lost composition possessing unity of design. The MS. belongs to the fifteenth century, but the date of the fragment lies between 1225 and 1250, and is younger than the "Poem of the Cid." The conclusions were discussed by Prof. Howland of Chicago.

Only one Old French paper was presented to the Association, and that was announced by

title: "The latest researches concerning Arras in the thirteenth century, and Adan de la Hale," by Prof. Rambeau of Massachusetts Institute of Technology. A related paper read by title was that of Prof. Bruce of Bryn Mawr: "Vita Meriadoci: a Latin romance of the thirteenth century, preserved in the Cotton MS. Faustina B. vi."

Three of the papers in medieval literature were on English subjects. One that created particular interest by its admirable presentation was "The Round Table Before Wace," by Mr. Brown of Harvard. Wace makes the first mention of the Round Table in his *Roman de Brut* in 1155, and says he follows Celtic traditions; but as Geoffrey of Monmouth says nothing of these, many of the best scholars have believed that Wace invented his statements. Layamon's *Brut* translates Wace with many new and curious additions, particularly about the Round Table; and it is likely he borrowed from Welsh tradition. The Greek historian, Posidonius, describes the Celts sitting at feasts. The incidents are always barbarous and primitive, the names are unknown, or where known approach Welsh spellings. More positive evidence are the tales of quarrels at feasts common to Celtic literature. The strongest warrior received a particular place at table, and from quarrels of precedence the Round Table was first used. The only argument against the Celtic origin is Silence; but the Mss. are not old, and we must go to Irish literature, where there are Irish banquet tales as early as the seventh century. All the many coincidences go to show that Layamon's account is not a fabrication, but a transcript of genuine Welsh tradition: the traditions are Pan-Celtic and thus were current in Britain and so in Wales. Prof. Bright of Johns Hopkins believed the conclusion the true one, and commended the method. He further suggested a question as to the precise meaning of Posidonius in describing the Celts who "sit in a circle, and the bravest sit in the middle, like the coryphæus of a chorus." The coryphæus, leading the chorus, would face outward from the circle; the chief would face inward. He sat, not in the centre, but in the middle with others on either hand. Posidonius continues: the "spear-bearers sit down opposite in a circle,

and feast in the same manner as their masters." The circular table would naturally interest the older nations as a variation from the Sigma tables.

"The Lambeth version of Havelok," by Mr. Putnam of Harvard, brought out that this version could not be derived from either of the two French versions in Gaimar and the Lay, differing independently from both. It must come from a lost French original, the common source of all three. With this Lambeth version as a check on each of the two French versions, it is possible to determine with some accuracy the form of the story in the lost version. This lost French version and the English romance probably go back to still earlier sources. Comments were made by Prof. Bright. The paper by Prof. McKnight of Ohio on "Germanic elements in King Horn," proceeding from the origin of the legend in the Danish invasions, sought to distinguish the traits which were common Germanic. The death of Horn's father and the adventures were held to have been originally more prominent; the love features developed later. The nationality of the love element was more difficult to determine, and many lines were hard to draw with clearness, even where a seeming Germanic nucleus of details could be traced.

IV. *Linguistic Studies.* These papers were all evidently the results of unusual thoroughness and care: two were on German subjects and one on English. The first was the paper by Prof. Kurrelmeyer of Franklin and Marshall, "On the historical development of the types of the first person plural imperative in German." Both Low German and High German were taken into account; eight types were treated in detail; and it was found that a certain type was a criterion for the date and original dialect of certain texts. This last discovery and the conscientious accuracy of the work were highly commended by Prof. Vos of Johns Hopkins. Prof. Vos' paper on "Rime-parallelism in Old High-German verse" was something akin. Rime-parallelism was characteristic of three of five works considered: a result agreeing with the supposed order of composition. Some light was thrown on the origin of rime in German and on the length of suffix syllables in Otfried.

"The appositive participle in Anglo-Saxon," by Prof. Calloway of Texas, was based upon a careful statistical reading of the whole of Anglo-Saxon literature, and of the more definitely known Latin originals of the prose texts. Divisions and classifications were given and illustrated: adjectival, predicate, adverbial, and co-ordinate. The origin is, in the main, from the Latin. Profs. Hart and Bright contributed to the discussion.

V. *Phonetics.* Last year it was Prof. Grandgent of Harvard, this year it was Prof. Hempl of Michigan, that read a paper under this head. Prof. Hempl had for his subject: "A'n't and h'n't." To the same two gentlemen, and to Mr. Babbitt of Columbia as Secretary, is due much of the activity of the American Dialect Society, the annual meeting of which was called by Prof. Grandgent for noon of Friday.

VI. *Pedagogical Discussion.* The last afternoon session was devoted to the final discussion of the Report of the Committee of Twelve on Modern Language teaching, but little or none was brought out beyond the interesting fact that in certain quarters the Report was selling for money. The paper of Prof. Joynes of South Carolina on "Dictation and Composition in Modern Language teaching," in his absence, was postponed for the expected discussion of the Report to follow: it urged that writing by dictation should have a much larger place and should substitute composition largely, if not wholly, during the earlier stages of study. The Report of the Committee of Twelve was formally submitted, as a U. S. Government document, by the chairman, Prof. Thomas of Columbia, who spoke for its acceptance for the principles involved, and not because of agreement in every particular. Prof. Hewett of Cornell, while differing personally in many points, regarded the Report as a monumental work denoting marked progress in Modern Language study, and moved its adoption. Prof. von Jagemann of Harvard and others expressed their commendation and indebtedness to the vigour and precision and clearness of the Report. It was then unanimously adopted.

At a previous session Prof. Magill of Swarthmore submitted his report on the practise of International Correspondence, as a means of Modern Language study, which, he believed,

was proving remarkably successful. The report was approved and the committee enlarged and continued.

The discussion not brought out by the Committee of Twelve was called forth by a suggestion of Prof. Cohn of Columbia as to the advisability of assigning not more than two papers to each session, so as to leave more time for general discussion, not diminishing at all any number of papers to be read by title or to be published. A very general animated, and in part irrelevant, debate followed, in which Prof. Cohn of Columbia, Magill of Swarthmore, Hewett of Cornell, Stoddard of New York, Price and Thomas of Columbia, Bright of Johns Hopkins, Bowen of Ohio, Harris of Western Reserve, Gudman of Pennsylvania, Hart of Cornell, and others, engaged. Prof. Cohn, having succeeded in his genial purpose of encouraging discussion at the meetings, withdrew his suggestion.

Among important matters brought up by the Secretary of the Association, Prof. Bright mentioned the purposes of the King Alfred Memorial in 1901, in which all English-speaking people are invited to share. A statute is to be erected and a public hall in Winchester, and a meeting of scholars will be held. A committee to prepare a suitable programme, with a view to taking part in this meeting, was appointed: Profs. Bright of Johns Hopkins, Cook of Yale, Hempl of Michigan, Henneman of Tennessee, Kittredge of Harvard, Manly of Chicago, and Mead of Wesleyan. Also interest was bespoken in the celebration of Dr. Furnivall's seventy-fifth birthday: a personal present to be given, a volume to be published in his honour, and, particularly, money contributions asked, for the cause of continuing the great work of the Early English Text Society in publishing inedited texts.

Several members of the Association were removed by death within the year: Prof. Hempl of Michigan read resolutions on George A. Hench of Michigan; Prof. Henneman of Tennessee on W. M. Baskervill of Vanderbilt; and Prof. Bright on D. L. Bartlett of Baltimore, D. C. Brinton of University of Pennsylvania, and Susan R. Cutler of Chicago, A. N. van Daell of Mass. Inst. of Technology, J. Luquiens of Yale, E. Kölbing of Breslau.

The committee on place of next meeting

(Prof. Learned of Pennsylvania, chairman), reported in favor of Philadelphia, to meet jointly with the Philological and other Associations next Christmas. The committee on election of officers (Prof. Henneman, chairman), reported the following for 1900: President, Thomas R. Price of Columbia; Secretary, James W. Bright of Johns Hopkins; Treasurer, Herbert E. Greene of Johns Hopkins; Executive Council: H. A. Rennert of Pennsylvania, G. Gruener of Yale, Pelham Edgar of Toronto, Ewald Flügel of Stanford, S. W. Cutting of Chicago, B. P. Bourland of Michigan, R. E. Blackwell of Randolph-Macon, E. S. Joynes of South Carolina, T. A. Jenkins of Vanderbilt. Officers of Phonetic and Pedagogical Sections to be continued; Editorial Committee, C. H. Grandgent of Harvard and the Secretary of the Central Division.

Before adjournment, by motion of Prof. Bright, the thanks of the Association were tendered to the members of the Local Committee, to President and Mrs. Low, to the officers of Columbia University and of the Century and University Clubs, for their hospitality and many courtesies.

These courtesies and attentions filled in a large part of the meeting, and determined its high degree of sociableness. For this the members of the Local Committee (Messrs. Price, Cohn, Thomas, Stoddard, Mott, Hyde, and Remy) were all solicitious. The University Library, Gymnasium, and buildings were open to the members; on Thursday at one Luncheon was served by the Local Committee; that evening President and Mrs. Low received the members at their residence; and thereafter the hospitality of the Century Club and of the University Club in its sumptuous new quarters was enjoyed. In the same spirit was the Kneipe on Wednesday evening, with nearly a hundred in attendance, carefully provided by Profs. Cohn and Thomas, where mingled the song of *Gaudeamus* and the patriotic hymns of France, Germany, England, and America. In face of the countless distractions of a metropolis the preservation of the solidarity of the meetings was a striking feature; and from all there is left the distinct remembrance of good fellowship and good work.

JOHN BELL HENNEMAN.

University of Tennessee.